

REMARKS

I. The 35 U.S.C. §112, Second Paragraph Rejection

Claims 8 and 9 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. Claim 8 has been amended to overcome this rejection. Claim 9 is dependent on claim 8; thus, claim 9 has overcome this rejection based on amendments made to claim 8.

II. The 35 U.S.C. §103 Rejections

Claims 1-2, 4, 7-11, 13, 15-20, 22-24, 29 and 31-34 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,937,041 issued to Cardillo (“CARDILLO”) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,308,221 issued to Perlman (“PERLMAN”). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections.

A. Claim 1

It is axiomatic that the combination of the cited references in a §103 rejection must disclose every element in the rejected claim. Claim 1 recites a system for providing Internet-related services ..., comprising:

a client module embedded in the handheld device to enable the handheld device to send a selected stored Universal Resource Locator (URL) via a local communication link, wherein the URL indicates a desired Internet web page;

a receiver that receives the URL sent from the handheld device via the local communication link;

a web access module coupled to the receiver and to an external Internet via an Internet communication link different from said local communication link to access and retrieve the desired web page from a remote web server via the external Internet; and

a render system being coupled to the web access module and physically separate from said handheld device, to render the retrieved web page in a human discernible format to a user on said render system.

Based on the arguments below, Applicant respectfully submits that neither CARDILLO nor PERLMAN (nor a combination of both) discloses or suggests at least one element of claim 1.

1. CARDILLO Does Not Disclose or Suggest the Client Module

Claim 1 recites a client module embedded in a handheld device to enable the handheld device to send a selected URL.

Assuming, arguendo, that CARDILLO's ADSI screen-display telephone terminal 110 is a "handheld device." See CARDILLO, Figure 1. However, the ADSI screen-display telephone terminal disclosed in CARDILLO does not have a client module to enable the handheld device to send a URL as recited in claim 1.

In CARDILLO, the telephone terminal "is connected to public switched telephone network (PSTN) that routes calls and data transfers from terminal 110 to the Network Application Vehicle (NAV) 130 via standard telephone interface lines 112 and 122." CARDILLO, col. 5, lines 51-57. "Terminal 110 communicates with NAV 130 by standard transmission of ADSI protocol transmission signals along line 112, PSTN 120, and line 122." CARDILLO, col. 6, lines 34-36. The ADSI protocol transmission signals are Dual Tone Multi Frequency (DTMF) signals. CARDILLO, col. 6, 36-38. Hence, in CARDILLO, the only signals sent by the ADSI telephone terminal are standard DTMF signals. These are not URLs. Instead, another component, the remote NAV (which is not a handheld device), must be used to convert the received DTMF signals into URLs.

In contrast, claim 1 recites a client module embedded in the handheld device to enable the handheld device to send a selected URL. Based on the foregoing, CARDILLO does not disclose or suggest the client module as recited in claim 1.

2. PERLMAN Does Not Disclose or Suggest the Client Module

Similarly, in PERLMAN, the Examiner cited the TV remote control as allegedly disclosing the handheld device as recited in claim 1.

In PERLMAN, the remote control sends infrared (IR) commands to the TV via an infrared communication link.

Remote control 11 is operated by the user in order to control the WebTV client 1 ... The WebTV box 10 receives commands from remote control 11 via an infrared (IR) communication link.

PERLMAN, col. 4, lines 46-50.

In PERLMAN, the handheld device (i.e., the remote control) does not have the capability of sending a selected URL. Instead, other non-handheld components (e.g., the WebTV server 5) must be used to convert the IR signals received from the remote control into URLs.

In contrast, claim 1 recites a client module embedded in the handheld device to enable the handheld device to send a selected URL. Thus, PERLMAN also does not disclose or suggest the client module as recited in claim 1.

Based on the foregoing, neither CARDILLO nor PERLMAN (nor a combination of these references) discloses or suggests the client module as recited in claim 1. Thus, claim 1 should be in condition for allowance.

B. Claims 2-12 & 19-28

Claims 2-12 & 19-28 are dependent upon independent claim 1. Based on the foregoing with respect to independent claim 1, these dependent claims should also be in condition for allowance.

C. Claim 13

Independent claim 13 recites a receiver module to receive a URL from a handheld device via a communication link. Based on the foregoing arguments for claim 1, claim 13 should also be in condition for allowance.

E. Claims 14-18

Claims 14-18 are dependent upon independent claim 13. Based on the foregoing arguments with respect to independent claim 13, these dependent claims should also be in condition for allowance.

F. Claim 29

Independent claim 29 recites a client module having similar limitations as recited in claim 1. Based on the foregoing arguments for claim 1 with regard to the client module, claim 29 should also be in condition for allowance.

G. Claims 30-31

Claims 30-31 are dependent upon independent claim 29. Based on the foregoing arguments with respect to independent claim 29, these dependent claims should also be in condition for allowance.

H. Claim 32

Independent claim 32 recites a communication module to receive communication from a mobile system, the communication including a selected URL. Based on the foregoing arguments for claim 1, claim 32 should also be in condition for allowance.

H. Claims 33-34

Claims 33-34 are dependent upon independent claim 32. Based on the foregoing arguments with respect to independent claim 32, these dependent claims should also be in condition for allowance.

II. Conclusion

Should the Examiner believe that a telephone interview would help advance the prosecution of this case, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned attorney.

Respectfully submitted,

By:


Roxana H. Yang
Registration No. 46,788

Law Office of Roxana H. Yang
P.O. Box 400
Los Altos, CA 94023
(650) 948-0822